

REMARKS***1) Drawings Objection — 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d)***

The drawings are objected to because they contain illegible handwritten material. Applicant submits herewith six (6) “Replacement Sheets” of drawings. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

2) Claim Rejections — 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,085,103 to Ramesh et al. (hereinafter “Ramesh”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,414,734 to Marchetto et al. (hereinafter “Marchetto”). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, certain criteria must be met. One such criterion requires the prior art reference or references, when combined, to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. With the above requirements in mind, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Ramesh, Marchetto, or the combination of Ramesh and Marchetto, fail to teach or suggest at least one claim limitation, for example, the claim limitation regarding “transmitting the plurality of independently faded signals to each of the wireless subscriber stations under test.” The Examiner asserts that this feature is disclosed in Ramesh at col. 4, lns. 3-10. *See Office Action dated July 2, 2007, page 3.* Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ramesh discloses a different technique to compensate for fading of a signal. At col. 4, lns. 3-10, Ramesh discloses two inputs to and one output from the fading compensation unit 28. Hence, the fading compensation unit 28 only outputs one faded signal. *See col. 4, lns. 11-12.* Multiple faded signals are not needed and are not output to each of the wireless subscriber stations because Ramesh transmits a single analog signal that is time compressed. *See col. 3, lns.*

27-28. In Ramesh, gaps in time are created between successive blocks of the time-compressed analog signal. *See col. 3, lns. 28-29*. The signal is time-compressed primarily to allow room for the introduction of pilot symbols. *See col. 3, lns. 29-30*. Ramesh is directed toward inserting pilot symbols into an analog signal to estimate fading of the analog signal. *See col. 4, lns. 15-18*. The pilot symbols have amplitude and phase that allow the receiver to determine the amount of fading. *See col. 4, lns. 38-42*. Ramesh does not transmit multiple faded signals. Hence, Ramesh does not teach or suggest transmitting a plurality of independently faded signals to each of the wireless subscriber stations.

Furthermore, a hypothetical combination of Ramesh and Marchetto would not teach or suggest transmitting a plurality of independently faded signals to each of the wireless subscriber stations. Marchetto is directed toward recovering simulcast paging data at a receiver subject to the three types of fading. *See col. 5, lns. 53-55*. The Examiner cites Marchetto for its disclosure of digital signals. *See Office Action dated July 2, 2007, page 3*.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Claim 1 is non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over Ramesh in view of Marchetto and should be allowable.

Claims 13, 25, and 37 include similar features as Claim 1 and therefore should also be allowable.

Dependent claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-36, and 38-48 depend from independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37, respectively, which are believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claims 2-12, 14-24, 26-36, and 38-48 are also non-obvious and patentably distinguishable over Ramesh in view of Marchetto.

Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-48 are presently standing in this patent application. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in this patent application to be in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that direct contact with Applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of this patent application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

QUALCOMM Incorporated

Dated: October 1, 2007

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

By: /Timothy E. Buckley/
Timothy E. Buckley
Registration No. 55,028
(858) 845-3519